

Thurmond, Strom

Finally, it is not disputed that our Declaration of Independence was, strictly speaking, illegal, just as any rebellion is illegal, as was the American declaration of Independence, until it was successful!

On moral grounds, however, it would seem that Rhodesia had just as good a case, if not a better one, in 1965 than America did in 1776.

This paper points out that Independent Rhodesia has not yet been recognized by any other country. Nevertheless it has peacefully maintained its independence in spite of all the efforts of Britain and other countries, including the United States of America, to suppress it for over a year now.

The State Department is reminded that Great Britain didn't acknowledge American Independence until some nine years after the Declaration.

It is rather early, therefore, for Americans to describe the Rhodesian Government as "an illegal regime which has temporarily usurped power" or "this white minority regime in a desparate and what will certainly prove to be a futile gesture". . . as this paper does.

While appreciating the present respect for legality existing in the United States of America, it is most surprising that she has chosen to take such a very narrow view about Rhodesia's declaration, in view of the circumstances of her own birth as a Nation!

One can only hope that it is due to the almost complete ignorance shown by American officialism, of the true facts of the case.

D. GARNER

For Under Secretary, External Services.

P.S.: I have just returned from a round Rhodesia trip accompanied by twelve American supporters of the F.O.R. and therefore my mail has suffered—however once I have whittled away this mountain I'll write to you more fully. Incidentally our friends couldn't find the "threat to world peace" (which they had been led to expect).

Yours in haste,

DOUG GARNER.

Anti-Communist Work of National Students Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the recent exposures of the connections between the CIA and the National Students Association, much was made of the supposed anti-Communist work of NSA. Yet to those who have long been familiar with the activities and projects of NSA, it seemed incredible that the far-left ideology of the NSA could ever have supported an effective anti-Communist program. Moreover, it seemed astonishing that the views of NSA, so obviously in the minority among student-age Americans, would ever be taken as representative of the United States.

An article written by Ken Thompson and published in the current issue of *Human Events* thoroughly demolishes whatever pretenses the NSA might have had to being anti-Communist. Mr. Thompson, the able associate editor of the *Richmond Times Dispatch*, recounts the NSA record. He demonstrates the

antidemocratic tactics which NSA has used to gain entrance to American college campuses and to establish its false claim as the representatives of American students. Most important, he shows that NSA's association with the CIA actually pulled the student group further to the left in the expression of its opinions than it would have been had it been left alone.

Mr. President, I recommend Mr. Thompson's devastating article to the attention of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that his article, entitled "Why College Students Should Reject the NSA," published in *Human Events* for April 1, 1967, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY COLLEGE STUDENTS SHOULD REJECT NSA—EACH YEAR MORE SCHOOLS LEAVE THE NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION AND EACH YEAR—PUSHED BY THE CIA, IT NOW TURNS OUT—THIS GROUP MOVES FURTHER TO THE LEFT

(By Ken Thompson)

When the sensational story of the Central Intelligence Agency's secret financing of the National Student Association was unveiled on the front pages of America's newspapers last month, a great many people became aware of the existence of NSA for the first time.

Although the association is now more than 20 years old and claims to be the largest, most influential student organization in the country, a relatively small segment of the population had heard of it or knew anything about it before its link with the CIA was exposed.

Probably even the vast majority of the million-plus students that NSA claims to "represent" in this country and abroad have been almost totally unaware of how the organization has been "representing" them. A good many undoubtedly had no idea that it was, in fact, "representing" them.

The reason is not difficult to explain. In the first place, there is no such thing as individual membership in NSA. From its inception, the organization has concentrated its recruiting efforts on currying favor with a handful of leaders on college and university campuses.

Where these efforts have been successful, entire student bodies, through the action of their student governments, have been formally affiliated with NSA—even though, in many cases, the vast majority of the students on these campuses may have been completely unaware that they were joining anything. Or, in a great many cases where the students have been informed of the affiliation, they have been overwhelmingly opposed to it.

Normally, however, they have been given no opportunity to register their disapproval or to prevent or annul the affiliation. Only in rare instances have NSA and its campus agents run the risk of going directly to the student body for a vote of approval—and for a very good reason.

On the few occasions that it has taken that risk or been forced to face a student referendum, NSA has usually been overwhelmed by a landslide of votes against affiliation.

Yet in spite of this, NSA claims to speak for some 1.3 million students enrolled in the colleges and universities whose student governments are formally affiliated with it. In fact, it often presumes to "represent" and accurately reflect the viewpoint of all American students. This, of course, is preposterous, for—according to its own figures—only 16 percent of the schools which are eligible to "join" NSA have chosen to affiliate with it. And the number has declined steadily for the past half decade.

SELF-APPOINTED SPOKESMEN

From a membership peak of some 350 schools in 1961, the number has dropped to approximately 275. According to the latest records available, 78 colleges and universities—among them some of the nation's largest—have severed their prior connections with NSA during the past five or six years. Another 23 schools considered joining the organization but rejected the idea.

Even NSA's claim to "represent" the relatively small number of schools which have retained their membership is questionable at best. Normally less than half of those schools even bother to send delegates to NSA's annual "Congresses," where the organization takes stands on a wide range of controversial subjects, purporting to represent the viewpoint or consensus of the average American student. And most of the delegates who do attend the "Congresses" are not democratically elected by their fellow students whom they purport to represent.

What it boils down to is that NSA, in truth, speaks for only a small group of self-appointed individuals who represent no one but themselves. Until the CIA-NSA scandal exploded in the headlines, the vast majority of America's students were probably unaware of the organization's existence. Much less were they cognizant that it presumed to "represent" them.

The National Student Association, of course, is no stranger to readers of *Human Events*. Throughout its existence, NSA has been exposed in this publication as one of the principal vehicles for left-wing agitation and propaganda among the nation's youth. It has also been an extremely vulnerable—and often all too willing—target for infiltration by the far left.

According to *Ramparts* magazine, which first blew the whistle on NSA's secret CIA financing, NSA "played a crucial role in the formation of [Stokely Carmichael's] Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and was one of its staunchest supporters." It has since cooperated with this radical "Black Power" outfit on several joint projects.

In a recent issue of *Commonweal* magazine, Wilson Carey McWilliams—who has been active in NSA and other leftist youth groups—spotlighted another one of the association's important contributions to the American political scene.

"It might be pointed out," noted McWilliams, "that so radical a group as SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] was born as a result of, and incubated during, the National Congresses of NSA, and SDS leaders like Paul Potter were national officers of the Association. There is a charm in the thought of CIA, however indirectly, financing SDS!" Not many months ago, NSA's current president, Eugene Groves, shared a platform with Bettina Aptheker, a self-proclaimed Communist, at a meeting of various leaders of the "New Left" who assembled to draw up plans for a national student strike this spring to protest America's "aggression" in Viet Nam. Groves describes himself as a "left-wing Democrat." Ed Schwartz, who is NSA's national affairs vice president, says he is well to the left of Groves.

Over the years NSA has taken a number of rather wild and irresponsible positions on some of the more controversial issues of the day. To cite a few examples, its annual "Congresses" have passed resolutions calling for the following:

- Abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
- Repeal of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Smith Act.
- Admission of Red China to the United Nations.
- Repeal of laws banning the sale of marijuana and LSD.

FOREIGN POLICY ATTACKED

Its resolutions have also condoned the Japanese student riots which prevented a

April 5, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1593

visit to that country by former President Eisenhower. They have termed the rioting at Berkeley an example of "responsible action" by students and pledged NSA legal support for those arrested. They have censured the United States for putting down violent anti-American riots in Panama.

In the area of civil rights, NSA's official pronouncements have supported the use of the most militant and revolutionary tactics, including "rent strikes," school boycotts and massive civil disobedience.

But it is in the field of foreign policy that NSA's policy statements and resolutions have been most irresponsible—and contradictory.

It has condemned the United States—hence, ironically, the CIA—for intervention in the Bay of Pigs (not, of course, because it was unsuccessful) and the Dominican Republic. But it has called for intervention in the affairs of the Republic of South Africa.

It has condemned the United States for "aggression" in Southeast Asia and demanded that we stop bombing North Viet Nam and call a halt to all offensive military action in South Viet Nam. It has not, however, condemned North Viet Nam for its aggression or demanded that the Viet Cong cease its atrocities, aimed primarily and intentionally at the civilian population in the south.

It has called for the overthrow of Diems and Batistas, but never for the overthrow of the world's Sukarnos and Maos.

So many of NSA's pronouncements have been so extreme in their left-wing bias and so contrary to the interests of the United States that it is not surprising that it has frequently attracted the interest and support of various Red-front groups and their leaders. Its actions have even, on occasion, been blessed with mild editorial endorsements from *The Worker*, the Communist party's official newspaper.

What is surprising to many, however, is that for 15 years the Central Intelligence Agency has been secretly financing a good many of NSA's activities. Apparently more than \$3 million of the taxpayers' money has been channeled through an assortment of dummy foundations and other CIA conduits into the NSA treasury. By some accounts the CIA has underwritten up to 80 per cent of the association's expenses since 1952.

The argument used by those who are now defending the CIA-NSA link is that the only way of communicating successfully with students in other parts of the world and to combat communism among the youth abroad is to enlist the services of American students who speak their language—or something very close to it. Thus the CIA was only being pragmatic—and looking out for America's best interests—in underwriting NSA's international activities.

It won't wash! In the first place, the CIA's assistance, in effect, helped to prop up NSA's fraudulent claim that it serves as an accurate barometer of student opinion in America. Thus, the CIA helped to distort the image of American students abroad. When NSA condemns U.S. policy in Viet Nam and claims to be speaking for the average American student, it is behaving at least as irresponsibly as Berkeley's beatniks, whose noisy demonstrations invite Ho Chi Minh to misjudge our true intentions and resolve.

It should also be noted that the CIA by no means restricted its generosity to NSA's international program.

The agency apparently picked up the tab for a \$140,000 deficit run up by NSA on a disastrous college bookstore venture. What that had to do with foreign policy, intelligence operations or national security is anybody's guess.

It also apparently covered a great many of NSA's administrative costs, including a 15-year lease, rent free, for the organization's Washington headquarters. It seems highly likely that, without such assistance, NSA might very well have folded its tent before this in view of the fact that its membership

has been steadily declining throughout the present decade.

FROM ALBATROSS TO ASSET

In any event, without the helping hand of the CIA, NSA certainly could not have exercised the degree of liberal and leftist influence it has brought to bear in purely domestic political affairs.

When the story of NSA's link with the CIA broke, the immediate assumption of many was that this would finish the organization for good; by its blundering, the CIA had accomplished in one flurry of headlines what Young Americans for Freedom and other conservative groups had been trying for years to do.

That may have been wishful thinking. For NSA's leaders are busily regrouping their forces and making a concerted effort to turn the CIA albatross into an asset.

A few years ago, NSA's over-zealous recruiters at the University of Indiana bought a full-page ad in the student newspaper featuring an endorsement of NSA as a "spearhead in the fight against communism" from none other than the House Committee on Un-American Activities—which NSA was, and still is, in favor of abolishing. The endorsement, of course, was a complete fraud. But NSA was desperate. It didn't want to lose Indiana.

Equally desperate today, NSA's spokesmen at Southern Methodist University, (see separate story on opposite page) are contending that the organization couldn't possibly be as left-wing as everybody has been saying, or the CIA wouldn't have even considered subsidizing it.

Some of NSA's officials are so desperate that they're even willing to peddle the major thesis of *Ramparts* magazine, which broke the story of the CIA link. According to *Ramparts*, what the whole story boiled down to was that the CIA's well-heeled militarists and right-wingers have bought off a group of once idealistic youngsters who sold their radicalism for 30 pieces of silver and a guaranteed exemption from the draft.

The thesis fits in neatly with the image that has been created for the CIA. To quote Walter Lippmann—and who is a better authority on the shibboleths of the left?—"The CIA has become the universal scapegoat for any rightist activity which people on the left and in the center dislike."

Because it has become the left's *beta noire*, conservatives have automatically rushed to its defense, assuming that it must be one of the very last outposts of good sense and right thinking in the federal establishment.

Is either assumption valid? Is it possible that both liberals and conservatives have misjudged the CIA?

Time magazine recently noted that a State Department veteran once confessed that "You'll find more liberal intellectuals per square inch at CIA than anywhere else in the government."

The *New Republic* quotes a former NSA leader as having said: "I used to think the CIA was some horrible Fascist conspiracy. Then I discovered it was a treasure-trove of liberalism, the one refuge for liberals during the McCarthy period."

Even *Ramparts* conceded that NSA's staff members who were told the secret of the CIA subsidy were tipped off that "In working with the CIA, they would be providing the information that would help get a more enlightened [i.e., more liberal] foreign policy presented in high Washington circles."

Mike Wood, a former NSA fund-raiser who gave *Ramparts* much of the information on which its expose was based, told an audience at the University of Virginia two weeks ago that whatever pressure the CIA applied on NSA came in the form of directing its international representatives to take a liberal-radical position on issues.

Wilson Carey McWilliams, writing in *Commonweal*, confirms Wood's story. "The sub-

stantive effect of NSA's relations with CIA," he says, "may come as a surprise to the liberal mind: Its ties to the agency almost certainly pulled NSA to the left in its political stance" [McWilliams' italics]. He adds that NSA's national affairs vice president, Edward Schwartz, has admitted that "to his knowledge CIA financing and support had never been exerted or employed for other than liberal goals."

A "NAIVE" CIA?

McWilliams also recalls an episode from his own experience with NSA. At the association's annual congress in 1960, some of the officers who apparently were cooperating with the CIA recommended that a resolution be adopted which "supported the aims of the Cuban revolution."

The reaction of many of the delegates was "hostile," says McWilliams—for after all, this was 18 months after Castro had come to power and revealed for all the world to see that he had far more in common with Lenin than George Washington. "A large number of delegates were eager to proceed to a severe indictment of 'Castroite totalitarianism,'" says McWilliams.

"At this point," he continues, "the 'conspiracy machinery' began to grind into painful public operation: national leaders held hurried 'secret' sessions; mysterious calls and visitations occurred; mistaking me for an 'insider,' a national official eagerly told me just why the International Commission's resolution must be passed. Those who were 'witty' (pry to the secret of the tie to CIA in the argot of the NSA leadership) had assured him, he said in stage-conspirator whispers, that NSA's influence overseas depended on the association's being friendly toward the Cuban revolution's goals; important 'contacts' felt the resolution essential."

In light of all this evidence, it is becoming increasingly difficult to explain away the scandal of the NSA subsidy by simply contending that the CIA must have been misinformed or naive. This is particularly true now that the names of so many other beneficiaries of CIA largess have been revealed—with but a few exceptions, the vast majority of them well to the left of center.

It's an unpleasant thought, but perhaps the CIA knew exactly what it was doing when it gave the Institute of International Labor Research (headed by Norman Thomas, Juan Bosch on the faculty) more than \$1 million to organize and assist leftist parties in Latin America.

It takes an awful lot of misinformation and naivete to pick Norman Thomas and Juan Bosch to serve as generals in the war against communism.

YAF VS. NSA: STUDENT EDITOR CONFUSED

An interesting footnote to the NSA battle at SMU: The editor of its newspaper, *The SMU Campus*, ought to be blushing at least as deep a red as the color on the faces of the student body leaders who were embarrassed by the disclosure of NSA's ties to the CIA shortly after they decided to join the association.

When copies of "The NSA Report"—a booklet put out by Young Americans for Freedom which was extremely critical of the association—were introduced in the campaign, the editor assailed YAF as a well-heeled organization which "spends its time and money on publications to attack NSA rather than offering any constructive programs on its own. NSA, however, has a small budget for publicity. . . ." It's hard to struggle along on a mere \$3 million from the CIA, while YAF has been wallowing in all that lucre—perhaps a couple hundred grand a year, not a penny of it from the government.

In another editorial, the *Campus* described YAF's booklet as shabby propaganda. "Contrary to popular belief," it said, the booklet is "not a publication of NSA, one of Young Americans for Freedom . . . many who did

April 5, 1967

A1594

not read the fine print mistook this booklet for NSA literature." Oh, come on, now! Every word in that booklet must have been in print too fine for the paper's editor and anyone else who could possibly have mistaken it for anything but a complete—and extremely well researched, reasoned and written—assault on NSA.

But such are the tactics of NSA's champions.

NSA TO BE MAJOR ISSUE IN SMU AND USC ELECTIONS

At two major American universities—Southern Methodist in Dallas and Southern California in Los Angeles—a couple dozen student body leaders have been sporting red faces for more than a month.

By decree of their student governments, both schools decided to join the National Student Association shortly before its connection with the Central Intelligence Agency was exposed—in SMU's case, two weeks before the bomb exploded, and at SC only two days before.

In both cases the action was rather typical of how NSA and its campus agents operate.

At SMU, the organization dispatched two recruiters to the campus in late January. As usual, they made no effort to sell the association's merits to the students themselves; instead, they conferred quietly with members of the Student Senate, which met a few days later, on January 31, to consider joining NSA.

Shortly before the meeting, several campus conservatives got wind of these developments and secured a promise from the student body president that no final decision on NSA would be made at the meeting. However, after listening to a plea from another NSA official who was flown in from California to address them, the members of the Senate voted by a margin of 15 to 6 to join the association. The motion to join was submitted by the same student body president who had promised that a decision would not be made.

Two days later opponents of NSA circulated a petition on campus demanding that a student referendum be held. Within six hours they had secured 1,300 signatures. On the day the CIA story broke, the Student Senate decided to reconsider its decision. When it met a week later, it was obvious even to NSA's staunchest supporters that the vast majority of SMU's students opposed affiliation with the association. But NSA received powerful assists from several sources.

The campus newspaper had outdone itself lobbying in behalf of NSA. The university's president, Dr. Willis Tate, observed that the issue was "clearly one for the students to decide," but promptly added that he had confidence in the Senate to make the right decision without a student referendum and defended NSA against charges that it is an "extremist" group.

A professor who was supposed to be the impartial moderator at the only public debate held on the subject made such obviously biased remarks as: "I'm pleased to see that SMU is entering the 20th Century."

Just before the Senate voted on the matter, its presiding officer pleaded with his colleagues: "Vote according to your own convictions rather than try to be representative of the student body." They did just that, deciding by a margin of 12 to 10 to reaffirm their earlier decision to join NSA without permitting the students to vote on the issue. They weren't about to make that mistake. Even at the University of Texas, which is far more radical than SMU, the students voted by a wide margin to withdraw from NSA a couple of years ago. And at SMU, in fact, on two prior occasions the student body had voted overwhelming against joining NSA.

Although the students at SMU have been prevented from voting directly on NSA, the association is still an important issue in the upcoming student government elections. If several pro-NSA members of the Senate are defeated, it is expected that body will then reverse its controversial vote to affiliate.

At Southern California—which had withdrawn from NSA a decade ago—the student body's executive council voted on February 12 to reaffiliate with the association.

Here again there was no effort made to win over the student body; that perhaps would have been futile and was unnecessary in any event. For NSA had a powerful ally in Taylor Hackford, USC's student body president, who had been wined and wooed last summer in Wisconsin at the association's annual congress.

The day after the vote was taken, the Young Republicans on campus circulated a petition demanding a referendum. When the CIA story broke, the Young Democrats and the campus chapter of Students for a Democratic Society—both of which initially opposed the referendum (it was probably too democratic, small "d")—switched their position. Significantly, however, they did not urge the students to vote against NSA in the referendum which they were now in favor of conducting.

Hackford opposed letting the students decide the matter "because it's such an emotional issue that I don't want it on the ballot."

And the campus newspaper chimed in with a charge that the Young Republicans, by calling for a referendum, "are undermining student government at USC." The students, it said, were not well enough informed. Stupid clods! However did they manage in the first place to elect such brilliant leaders who must make all their decisions for them?

Unlike SMU, the student government at USC is required to hold a referendum if a sufficient number of students demand one. The YRs had no trouble getting more than enough signatures on their petition. So in early April a vote on the entire student body will be taken, and the betting is better than even that NSA will lose.

Caucus when almost one-third of the Democrats in the House voted to go on record as favoring a change in rules that would allow for the permanent dispatch of this ancient remnant of McCarthyism. And during the first week of the 90th Congress, more than two dozen abolition resolutions, several of them introduced by Republicans, were referred to the Rules Committee.

Pragmatists on "The Hill" scoff at the repeated efforts of aroused citizens to get HUAC junked, declaring that it is now an institution and is a vehicle for political careers (its most "famous" graduate being Richard Nixon). But it is precisely because of this, and that last-ditch segregationists now plan on using the committee to smear the civil rights movement and rehabilitation of the ghettos—that HUAC must be constantly opposed and discredited.

The arguments are as old as the committee: that it is unconstitutional, that it denies due process to witnesses; that it has served virtually no legislative purpose; that its appropriation could be used for much more worthwhile causes (its annual budget is the fourth largest among standing House committees).

Labor well knows that those who abuse the First Amendment in their alleged hunt for "subversives" eventually find their target in all organized social and economic movements seeking a change for the better. That is why the USWA, at its last Constitutional Convention called for abolition of HUAC, which it said "is not dedicated to gathering information, but to conducting inquisitions without any legitimate legislative purpose."

The committee, with few exceptions in its long history, has been a panel of white supremacists and ultra-rightists who have been cloaked in the respectability and the immunity of Congress in carrying out their witch hunts. House members should join in the protest by voting against its appropriation this month as a means of seeking open debate on its very existence.

Editorial in the Asian World by Dr. Diosdado M. Yap Exemplifies Asian Interest in American Involvement in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I recently read an editorial in the Asian World on American involvement in southeast Asia. Editor Diosdado M. Yap's cogent remarks serve as a reminder that we are performing a vital service as we strive for a peaceful Vietnam, free from aggression, free to make its own decisions, and free to live unharassed by its neighbors.

President Johnson's trips to Asia and Guam have done much to unite Asians and Dr. Yap's comments point out the prevailing feeling in Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, "America in Asia," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

AMERICA IN ASIA

Perhaps never before in the history of the United States has the problem of her rela-

The House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, once again the House of Representatives is faced with the question of providing funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It therefore may be of interest to my colleagues to be aware of the position of one of the Nation's foremost labor unions, the United Steelworkers of America, in opposition to the committee, as expressed in the following editorial:

[From Steel Labor, March 1967]

WHACK HUAC

The biennial effort to gain the floor on the opening of Congress to propose abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee failed again this year, but abolitionists took heart in significant and increased opposition to the committee among members of the House.

The blow was softened at the Democratic